

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-29 were originally filed in this patent application. In response to the first office action dated 08/24/2006, an amendment was filed on 11/22/2006 that cancelled claims 4-5, 7, 13-14, 16, 20-21, 24-25, and 27 and amended claims 1, 6, 8-10, 15, 17-19, 26, and 28-29 and added claims 30-32. In the pending office action, claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10-12, 15, 17, 19, 22-23, 26, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Global Events and Global Breakpoints in Distributed Systems” by Haban and Weigel (hereinafter Haban) in view of US Re. 36,852 to Heinen, Jr. (hereinafter Heinen). Claims 9, 18, and 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haban in view of Heinen further in view of US 6,083,281 to Diec et al. No claim was allowed. In this amendment, claims 1-3, 6, 10-12, 15, 19, 22-23, 26 and 30-32 have been cancelled. Claims 8-9, 17-18 and 28-29 are currently pending.

REMARKS

Rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10-12, 15, 17, 19, 22-23, 26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The examiner rejected claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10-12, 15, 17, 19, 22-23, 26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haban in view of Heinen. Claims 1-3, 6, 10-12, 15, 19, 22-23 and 26 have been cancelled herein, and therefore need not be addressed. The remaining claims in this group are claims 8, 17 and 28, which are addressed below.

In rejecting claim 8, the examiner admits Haban does not explicitly disclose modifying a program variable in a second job. The examiner then states Heinen teaches a message that modifies a program variable in a second job, citing col. 7, lines 30-32 of Heinen. The cited language of Heinen states:

... DEPOSIT – a message requesting that data forming part of the message be deposited in the memory of the specified job or process; ...

The examiner's mapping of Heinen on claim 8 fails for two reasons. First, the express teachings of Heinen do not teach or suggest modifying a program variable. The depositing of information in the memory of a specified job or process does not imply modifying a program variable. The memory could contain a table of information that is modified that has nothing to do with program variables. Second, the DEPOSIT command in Heinen is a user command as specified at col. 7 line 28 of Heinen. A DEPOSIT command thus allows a user to specify what data is deposited in the memory of a specified job or process. The DEPOSIT command of Heinen thus expressly teaches away from the limitations in claim 8, which states:

... an inter-job breakpoint mechanism that detects at least one condition in the first job and, in response thereto, modifies a program variable in the second job.

The modifying of a program variable in the second job as expressly recited in claim 8 is performed by the inter-job breakpoint mechanism in response to the inter-job breakpoint mechanism detecting at least one condition in the first job. Providing a user DEPOSIT command as taught in Heinen does not read on a software mechanism that modifies a program variable in the second job in response to the software mechanism detecting at least one condition in the first job. Because neither Haban, Heinen, nor their combination teach or suggest an inter-job breakpoint mechanism that detects at least one condition in the first job and, in response thereto, modifies a program variable in the second job, claim 8 is allowable over the combination of Haban and Heinen. In addition, claims 17 and 28 include limitations similar to those in claim 8 discussed above, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claims 8, 17 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Rejection of claims 9, 18 and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The examiner rejected claims 9, 18 and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haban in view of Heinen and further in view of Diec. Claims 30-32 have been cancelled herein, and therefore need not be addressed. In the rejection, the examiner admits the Haban-Heinen combination does not explicitly disclose the response outputs a debug message to a second job's output. The examiner then states Diec teaches these limitations, citing col. 2 lines 1-5 of Diec, which recites: "issuing a message to another software object to trigger generation of tracing data." The examiner's mapping of Diec on the limitations in claim 9, 18 and 29 is in error because issuing a message to another software object as taught in Diec does not read on outputting a debug message to the second job's output as recited in claims 9, 18 and 29. While issuing a message to another software object to trigger generation of tracing data may read may result in generating output from a job, the message is not *in* the output from the job. As a result, claims 9, 18 and 29 are allowable over the combination of Haban, Heinen and Diec, and applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claims 9, 18 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Conclusion

In summary, none of the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, teaches, supports, or suggests the unique combination of features in applicants' claims presently on file. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By /derekpmartin
Derek P. Martin
Reg. No. 36,595

MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 548
Carthage, MO 64836-0548
(417) 358-4700